



Missouri Department of Natural Resources

MINUTES

MISSOURI SOIL AND WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

DNR CONFERENCE CENTER

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI

May 24, 2005

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Elizabeth Brown, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS: DEAN THOMAS PAYNE, UNIV. OF MISSOURI: David Baker; **JOHN HOSKINS, DEPT. OF CONSERVATION:** Brad McCord; **FRED FERRELL, DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE:** Dan Engemann; **DOYLE CHILDERS, DEPT OF NATURAL RESOURCES:** Doyle Childers

ADVISORY MEMBERS PRESENT: SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM: Sarah Fast; **NRCS:** Dwaine Gelnar **MASWCD:** Peggy Lemons

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Davin Althoff, Gary Baclesse, Milt Barr, Jim Boschert, April Brandt, Allan Clarke, Noland Farmer, Gina Luebbering, Joyce Luebbering, Dean Martin, McGhee Adam, Theresa Mueller, Marcy Oerly, James Plassmeyer, Josh Poynor, Jeremy Redden, Ron Redden, Kevin Scherr, Judy Stinson, Ken Struempf, Lindsay Tempinson, Chris Wieberg, Bill Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: DISTRICTS: BARTON: Ben Reed; BATES: Al Decker, Brad Powell; BENTON: Bill Brouk, Willard Gerken, Tina Hovendick, Jamie Henderson, Leroy Morarity, Merdith Palmer, Gene Schmitz; CALDWELL: Wendy Bowen; CARROLL: Pat Davis; DALLAS: Mat Hale, Tony Rosen; MARIES: Sandy Hutchison; MERCER: Beth Walter; MONTGOMERY: Gayle Adams, Ann Whitehead; RANDOLPH: Shelly Sumpter; SCOTT: Ken Westrich; STODDARD: Kurt LeBeau; VERNON: Mark Curtis; WARREN: Chris Merritt, Debbie Niederer; WRIGHT: Connie Krider, Missy Wollard; **STATE OF MISSOURI: ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE:** Zora Mulligan; **DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION:** Paul Calvert; **DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES:** Scott Totten, Bill Oerly, Don Summers; **OTHERS:** MISSOURI FARM BUREAU: Ron Hardecke ; UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI: Steve Jeanetta; **INDIVIDUALS:** Geral Rinacke

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 2

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Elizabeth Brown called the meeting to order at the DNR Conference Center in Jefferson City, Missouri, in the Bennett Spring/Roaring River Room at 8:35 a.m.

Chairman Brown introduced two new commission members, Kathryn Braden from Taney County and Richard Fordyce from Harrison County.

B. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Leon Kreisler made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2005 commission meeting as mailed. John Aylward seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

C. PLANNING

1. Strategic Planning – Steve Jeanetta, University of Missouri

Steve Jeanetta presented an update on the commission's planning process. Mr. Jeanetta provided the commission with copies of the results of the meetings held last summer and at the training conference. Mr. Jeanetta stated that they had been working for three years on two projects. The first was looking at planning and ways to incorporate planning into the work of the organization. The second part was developing a new plan for the commission. The commission and Mr. Jeanetta worked on a development of a process and over the last year the process was implemented. The two key characteristics of it were that during the Area Meetings last August there were sessions and the priorities were summarized for each area. This information was compiled and a set of regional priorities were compiled into a statewide list.

Some of the values that came out of the meetings were conserving our natural resources, meeting the needs of landowners, and accountability.

The goals that came out of the draft were soil conservation, water quality, land stewardship, and changing land-use. Soil conservation was to conserve the productive power of Missouri's agricultural land for current and future generations by preventing and reducing soil erosion. Water quality was to maintain, improve, and protect the water quality of Missouri's streams and lakes by supporting locally led, watershed-based projects that provide landowner, district, and communities with the information and resources they need. Land stewardship and changing land use was for the commission to promote the stewardship of Missouri's land for long-term sustainability.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 3

Leon Kreisler stated he did not feel that the changing land use was as important as the water quality and soil erosion. Elizabeth Brown stated she thought the changing land use was more in the urban areas. Mr. Jeanetta replied that it was not just happening in the urban areas, but also in agricultural areas. Ms. Brown stated that small acre landowners will go to the district offices asking questions, and that is where the education would play a part. Mr. Jeanetta asked that as an organization, what role would the commission take part in. Sarah Fast stated that if this was an area of concern this could be worked on and an objective could be for the commission to determine what their role would be. Ms. Fast stated that the impression she was getting was to rework the changing land use and make it more an issue than a goal. Mr. Kreisler stated that through soil and water conservation they would want to promote long-term sustainability for land stewardship and the changing land use should not be there because it is not the commission's function to change land use. Ms. Brown stated that as areas change the commission might have to get involved. Mr. Kreisler stated they might have to change what they are doing. Mr. Jeanetta stated they could rework that issue, because the intention was to not make addressing land use an object of the organization, but more an understanding of how it impacts the commission's work and how it might impact some of the programs in the future.

Mr. Jeanetta stated that the implementation part of the plan needed more work. This is where the different kinds of ideas came up at the Area Meetings. These would be the tools used to meet the soil and water conservation goals.

John Aylward stated he felt that the commission was already doing everything that was presented to them in the report. Mr. Jeanetta stated that was the impression he got from visiting with people. Mr. Jeanetta informed the commission they would rework some of the issues. Revisions would be done in June and July, Area Meetings would be in August, and the final draft would be presented to the commission in September.

D. CLOSED MINUTES

Zora Mulligan passed out copies from the last three closed sessions. The dates were November 4, 2004, January 25, 2005, and March 16, 2005. Kathryn Braden asked if she and Richard Fordyce could vote on these since they had seen them. Ms. Mulligan answered yes.

John Aylward made a motion to approve the closed minutes of the January 25, 2005 commission meeting as mailed. Leon Kreisler seconded the motion. When polled, John

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 4

Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Leon Kreisler made a motion to approve the closed minutes of the March 16, 2005 commission meeting as mailed. Kathryn Braden seconded the motion. When polled, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Kathryn Braden made a motion to approve the closed minutes of the November 4, 2004 commission meeting as mailed. Leon Kreisler seconded the motion. When polled, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Mulligan informed Ms. Brown and Ms. Fast that they would need to sign the original copies of the minutes. At that time Ms. Mulligan collected the copies the commissioners had.

E. REVIEW/EVALUATION

1. District Assistance Section

a. Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 District Assistance Grants

Jim Boschert presented a review of the FY06 district assistance grants. There are four grants available to the districts to help with personnel and administrative costs. They are the district assistance allocation, matching grant, district employee benefit grant, and the information/education grant.

The total projected amount for the district assistance grants for FY06 is \$8,143,032. This total includes an increase of \$231,040 for the employee benefit grant that was approved by the legislature.

The total available for the district assistance grants for FY06 is \$6,400,000. This total includes an allocation of \$6,400,000, plus \$1,493,032 for the employee benefit grant and \$250,000 available through the information/education grants.

Mr. Boschert stated that for the upcoming fiscal year, that begins July 1, there were no additional funds available in the district assistance allocation. The district assistance allocation refers to the management services grant, the technical services grant, the administrative expenses grant, and the matching grant program. According to commission policy,

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 5

the district's district assistance funding would not be reduced from one year to the next to maintain stability for the local district board.

Mr. Boschert informed the commission unless they had any other direction for staff, that the districts would be notified, after the appropriation process is complete, that their allocation for FY06 would be the same as FY05. It was the consensus of the commission to keep the same policy.

Jim Boschert presented a report on the FY05 district employee benefit grant and the first three-quarters of the current fiscal year.

Last fiscal year, the total for health insurance expenses was \$785,961, retirement was \$317,691, and the total claimed from the benefit grant was \$1,103,652. This was an increase of \$135,944 from the previous year and that left \$158,340 for the commission to cover the increased expenses in health insurance and retirement for FY05.

For the first three-quarters of the current fiscal year, \$666,391 was the amount claimed for health insurance expenses. For retirement, \$240,861 was claimed in the same time period. It was estimated that for the fourth quarter the expenses claimed would be close to what was claimed in the third quarter. The estimated total for health insurance is \$903,631 and \$320,203 for retirement. These totals come to \$1,223,834 claimed against the grant.

The policies that govern the benefit grant stated that the benefit grant could only be used for health insurance and retirement. Health insurance allocation is based on the least cost premium available through Missouri Consolidated, and there is currently a \$10 copay per month per employee. Retirement salaries are updated twice a year and retirement is 5 percent of the district employee's salary as of July 1 and January 1.

Districts are allowed three different options for paying health insurance. The first one is the district paying the insurance company directly. Another option is that districts can pay the district employee's spouse's employer for coverage for the district employee. The last option is paying the employee directly for individual coverage. Based on a recommendation from the benefit committee, the commission decided they would no longer pay the employee direct for individual coverage. The commission did decide to allow employees that previously used this option, to be grandfathered in.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 6

Mr. Boschert stated the benefit committee figured the cost of future years expense by calculating a 20 percent increase in health insurance and a 10 percent increase in retirement. It was pointed out that it is difficult to determine the health insurance cost from one year to the next because of the continuing climb of health insurance premiums.

When asked if there had been problems with the current policy, Mr. Boschert answered no. Peggy Lemons from the benefit committee stated she had not heard anything either.

Elizabeth Brown stated it was the consensus of the commission to maintain current policy.

Mr. Boschert stated the districts would be notified of their allocations after the appropriation process is completed.

It was pointed out that the commission had made a motion in the past to ask for an expansion each year to cover the additional cost for health insurance and retirement for district employees. Mr. Boschert stated that it is anticipated that an increase of \$258,241 would be needed to cover additional expenses. The amount of \$258,241 will be asked for as an expansion for FY07.

b. Approval of Fiscal Year 2006 Information/Education Grant Proposals

Jim Plassmeyer presented a review of the information/education program that began in FY04. The program is a competitive program among the districts to fund new and innovative projects. The \$250,000 for the program came from the loan interest-share program. Proposals from the districts are ranked and reviewed by the information/education review committee and then presented to the commission for approval. The review committee consists of a representative from the Department of Agriculture (MDA), Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC), NRCS, Extension, the commission, and program staff.

On April 26, 2005, the committee met and reviewed the 24 proposals received from 20 different districts for a total of \$90,568.98.

The committee reported that 22 districts, approved for the current fiscal year, asked for funding over multiple years. Multiple year proposals can

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 7

be for up to three years with the second and third years subject to demonstrated progress. The committee felt that 22 districts showed good progress and that their projects should be funded as requested. FY06 will be the third and final year for 14 of the 22 projects if approved by the commission. The 22 districts requested \$125,383.24 for the second and third year of their projects.

Before the request for FY06 proposals were sent out, the commission approved some changes recommended by the review committee. The review committee recommended that for FY06 there would not be any new proposals accepted with salary in the budget. Proposals with multiple year projects are reviewed first with their funding coming off of the budget amount before any new proposals are reviewed. By reviewing the multiple year projects first, they utilize the commission's 30 percent limit of the total budget for salary. The salary limit was set because there were concerns, when the program was set up, that without a limit on salary all of the money could go toward salary and there would not be any funds left to do anything else. The committee made the recommendation to the commission not to accept salary in the new proposals for FY06. The committee also recommended that the districts have a local representative from NRCS, MDC, and University Extension sign the proposals. The reason for this was because some agency staff did not know the district was working on a proposal and may be able to have some input to the project.

The committee recommended funding 20 of the 24 proposals received for a total of \$65,789.98. Some were not recommended because they did not have enough information about the proposal.

Kathryn Braden made a motion to approve the committee's recommendation. John Aylward seconded the motion.

When asked about Wright and Warren Counties proposals for educational tools and the farming network, Mr. Plassmeyer answered that the Wright County one was for a grazing network, such as pasture walk, tours of different grazing systems, and the Warren County was for informational videos, CDs, and DVDs to loan to schools, or use in presentations.

When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 8

F. REQUESTS

1. District Assistance Section

a. Atchison Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) – Information/Education Grant Extension

Jim Plassmeyer presented a request from Atchison SWCD asking to extend their information/education grant for six months. Atchison's proposal was approved in FY04 as a two-year project. The project was to develop an outdoor classroom and to conduct a conservation day. The outdoor classroom has been constructed, but they have not conducted the conservation day.

According to a letter, the district will not be able to complete the project this year because Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) misplaced the signs to label the plants. The district would like to postpone the conservation day until September when the schools are back in session. The district asked that they be able to extend the project for six months and use the \$2,500 that was approved in the original proposal for the conservation day.

The district also asked that they be able to amend their original budget request. In the approved proposal, the budget for the conservation day was for \$2,500 and it would be used for conducting a conservation day which included purchasing snacks, lunches, and copying literature. The letter also requested that they be able to purchase bug nets and packets for the children. The bug nets would stay with the outdoor classroom and be used to catch bugs and insects and dip things out of the pond. The packets would include coloring books, colors, and other small giveaway items for the children to take home with them. The district stated they would not need all of the \$2,500 to conduct the conservation day and they would like to be able to buy the bug nets and packets.

When asked what Dave Baker thought about it, Mr. Baker asked what specifically would be in the packets. Mr. Plassmeyer stated that when he contacted the district they said it would be little momentum items to mark the occasion, such as coloring books, colors, and just little items like that. Mr. Baker stated he would like to know how those relate to the educational principle of the grant. Kathryn Braden asked if the commission had in the past granted a time variance or an amendment, Mr. Plassmeyer answered this was the first one that had requested a time extension, but there had been instances where districts wanted to change

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 9

or modify their budget. When asked what their initial request was for, Mr. Plassmeyer answered the \$2,500 was just for the conservation day. When asked if there was another call, could they submit it then. Mr. Plassmeyer answered this could affect the amount of money available for another call. Brad McCord from MDC stated he would follow up on the sign issue.

John Aylward made a motion to approve the board's request to extend the project for six months, but leave the budget as it was in the original proposal. Kathryn Braden seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Plassmeyer informed the commission that there were some additional funds left, since all the funds were not obligated in the first call. The amount left was \$56,326.78 for some additional proposals. Mr. Plassmeyer asked if the commission would want to offer a second call for FY06 to the districts with the stipulations that the funding could not be used for salary and the proposals would have to be for projects to be completed during the current fiscal year?

In response to a question about the amount left, Mr. Plassmeyer reiterated it was \$56,326.78 from the original \$250,000 budget.

Kathryn Braden made a motion to approve a second call. John Aylward seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

G. REVIEW/EVALUATION - Continued

1. District Assistance Section

a. Review of District Assistance Grant Policies

Jim Boschert presented a report to the commission regarding bonuses paid to district employees, meal expenses for district employees and supervisors, clothing items, and promotional items purchased by the district.

The commission developed policy on bonuses that are paid to district employees. Bonuses are not allowed from either state, local, or federal funds received by the district. Bonuses to district employees are a

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 10

violation of the Missouri Constitution and this information can be found in the districts operations handbook.

In the current fiscal year, three districts paid additional salary payments to their employees and documentation was not available to support the additional payments.

When asked what happens when payment is made to the employee, Mr. Boschert answered they are asked to pay them back. If the expense is taken out of state funds the expense is transferred to the local fund and the employee will have to repay the district. The expense is either paid back by the employee in a lump sum or payments to the district.

The next issue that Mr. Boschert covered was meals for district supervisors and employees.

During the review of the quarterly reports it was notice that one district had meal expenses that concerned the program staff. The expenses were incurred during the training conference. The cost of the nine meals was \$498.00. The individual meals ranged from \$43.53 to \$93.01. Two other receipts showed totals of \$163.95 and \$69.48 for meals. When these were received the program office staff wrote the district and requested that they transfer a portion of the expenses to the local funds.

The letter to the district stated the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) always recommends that soil and water district representatives use state funds within reasonable guidelines. The U.S. Government rate for the Osage Beach area is \$18.00 for dinner and \$1.00 for incidentals. These amounts total \$19.00, which would be claimed from the state grants, and all other expenses were to be transferred to the local funds. Even though these expenses are transferred to local funds, the expenses of the meal could be an audit finding.

State Travel regulations state that employees and officials are expected to exercise the same care in incurring expenses as a prudent person would exercise if traveling on personal business. Meals and hotel expenses shall be in reasonable relationship to their average cost for the cities where the expenses are incurred.

Mr. Boschert informed the commission that the districts would be notified of the policy.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 11

The next two items that Mr. Boschert presented to the commission was clothing items and promotional items purchase by the districts. During the quarterly report review, concerns were noticed with these items

The State Auditor completed an audit in July of 2004 that addressed promotional items purchased by state agencies. The finding from the state audit report was that spending for promotional items and gifts was unnecessary and excessive. The recommendations were to discontinue purchasing and distributing unnecessary and excessive promotional items and gifts, discontinue giving gifts and promotional items to state employees, legislators and private organizations and finally ensure promotional items serve a public purpose.

In our review of the quarterly reports, 14 districts purchased shirts or jackets with either the administrative expenses grant or a matching grant. The amounts spent by the districts ranged from \$96 to \$1,779. It was noted that one district purchased two leather coats for \$135 each plus there were other items that cost over \$50 per item. When asked what the purchases would be used for, the response from the district was that the items would be given out at several different district functions to cooperators, contractors, vendors, conservation partners, board members, and staff to promote and advertise the district.

While researching the issue, current policy states that the program management decides on the amount of these items to be purchased and it varies from program to program within DNR. The Soil and Water Conservation Program purchases one DNR labeled shirt for the new employee.

The final issue that Mr. Boschert presented to the commission was promotional items bought by the districts.

This issue was also found during the review of the fourth quarter quarterly reports. What was found was that several districts had purchased promotional items with both the administrative expenses grant and the matching grant program. The amount that ten districts spent in state funds for promotional items ranged from \$78 to \$2,805.

When asked, districts responded that these expenses were to replenish their supplies as they ran out. Because of this, they may have a large

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 12

expense one-year, but then not buy any promotional items for several years.

In the state audit report, staff auditor's office asked several questions to determine the reasonableness and/or necessity of expenditures for promotional items. A few of the questions that were asked were: did the purchased item promote a particular program or product of the agency, was the item necessary to accomplish the business purpose, and was the item extravagant for the purpose it was given. The recommendations from the state audit report were to: discontinue purchasing and distributing unnecessary and excessive promotional items, discontinue giving gifts and promotional items to state employees, legislators, and private organizations, and ensure promotional items serve a public purpose.

Elizabeth Brown stated she felt that the purchase of leather coats was excessive. Peggy Lemons stated that several districts purchase the shirts, especially for information/education because if you go to a school or an organization for a presentation it is nice to have on identifiable clothing. Leon Kreisler asked what the policy was for the shirts for the program. Mr. Boschert answered that when a new person is hired, the program buys them one shirt that has the DNR label. Scott Totten stated there was no defined department policy. Ms. Brown agreed with Ms. Lemons' statement, but she felt there needed to be a limit. When asked where the money comes from, Mr. Boschert answered they were purchased with either the administrative expenses grant or the matching grant program. When asked if this is unlimited, Mr. Boschert answered that with the administrative expenses grant the districts are given an allocation at the beginning of the year and they divide it their management, administration, or technical funds. With the matching grant, each district is given \$5,000 at the beginning of the year. They send in a proposal as to how they want to use the money. The \$5,000 of state money is matched with \$5,000 of local funds. Peggy Lemons asked if a district used shirts or other items as awards, would it be considered clothing or would it be put into another category. Mr. Boschert answered that they had put all clothing in one category and the promotional items in a different category and he would consider the awards to be in the clothing category. Kathryn Braden asked where the items showed up in the districts projected budget. Mr. Boschert answered that he had not looked at the budgets, but what they usually see is one category for information/education and most of these expenses are included there.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 13

Kathryn Braden made a motion to table the issue. Failing to receive a second, the motion died.

Richard Fordyce made a motion to set a \$250 per year per district amount as the maximum that a district can spend on clothing items for supervisors and employees from state funds. Leon Kreisler seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Boschet restated the issue before the commission regarding setting a limit on state dollars that could be used to purchase promotional items.

John Aylward made a motion to set no limit but provide guidance to the districts in the form of the questions asked by the state auditor during their review. Kathryn Braden seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Land Assistance Section

a. Cost-Share

1. Monthly Cost-share Usage and Fund Status Report

Noland Farmer reported that as of the end of the 3rd quarter of FY05 the districts had obligated \$19,600,000 of the \$24,500,000 that had been allocated for regular cost-share. This time last year, they had obligated \$19,900,000 of the \$23,400,000 that they were allocated. As of March 31, \$8,900,000 was claimed compared to \$10,500,000 in FY04 for the same time period.

It was projected that only \$20,000,000 of the funds allocated would be claimed, because it is unlikely that the entire amount allocated to the districts would be claimed. This projection was based on trends of previous years.

As of April 30th, \$10,100,000 in claims had been processed, which was \$4,400,000 short of the projection.

As of May 20, 2005, \$12,400,000 in claims had been received compared to \$13,400,000 last year.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 14

By the end of June, last fiscal year, the districts claimed \$19,600,000.

2. Allocation of the Fiscal Year 2006 Cost-Share Appropriation

Ron Redden presented a review of the FY06 cost-share allocations. The House and Senate approved a budget of \$20,250,000 for regular cost-share. This amount is the same as FY05 appropriations.

Half of the appropriation must be allocated evenly among the 114 districts. This is referred to as the geographic distribution and the portion distributed to each district is \$88,815. The other half of the appropriation is apportioned by the commission by considering the relative need for eligible practices according to the criteria developed by the commission. This half is referred to as the needs distribution of the cost-share appropriation.

Through FY98, the needs distribution portion was based on the percentage of highly erodable cropland in each district based on the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) numbers from 1972. During the mid 1990s there was a large reserve available, which resulted in each district's needs being met. By FY98, the reserve fund had been depleted and NRI numbers were not available on an individual county basis.

In FY99, the needs distribution was based on the percentage of the amount the district claimed during fiscal years 1995-1997.

Mr. Redden informed the commission that with the current NRI data that is available, it would be difficult to come up with a new allocation system that was more fair and reasonable than what has been used the past six years. It was pointed out that the budget process changed in FY05 where funds not claimed the previous year would no longer be available as reappropriated funds. Any funds not claimed will automatically go back into the Soils Sales Tax Fund. The commission in the past had used the reappropriated funds as additional funds to the districts that claimed at least 80 percent of their previous year's total allocation.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 15

By allocating the reappropriated funds, the commission made available between \$23,000,000 - \$25,000,000 each year for cost-share. It is only by having this amount available for the districts to obligate, that the \$20,250,000 is close to being claimed annually.

To have a greater opportunity to claim all of FY06 appropriation, the commission will have to over-allocate funds to the districts.

The E budget line that was approved for the cost-share program will allow the commission the same flexibility that they had in FY05. The E budget line represents an estimate.

To have a greater opportunity to claim all of FY06 appropriation, the commission will have to over-allocate funds to the districts. If not over allocated, the cost-share amount estimated to be claimed would not be over approximately \$15,000,000 in FY06.

Mr. Redden pointed out that in August the commission would be asked to approve allocating additional funds to districts that claimed over 80 percent of their total FY06 allocation.

When asked if the formula had worked well in the past, Mr. Redden answered that it had and they did not have a subjective way to determine the soil erosion in a county was greater or less today than what it was five years ago.

The commission concurred to allocate the funds as they had done in FY05.

b. Special Area Land Treatment (SALT)

1. Approval of 7th Call AgNPS SALT Grants

Ken Struempf presented a request for approval of the AgNPS SALT proposals received in the seventh call.

In June 2004 there was a call issued for the seventh call applications. In September 2004, the program office received 23 preliminary applications. Then in October 2004, staff approved 23 districts for \$5,000 each for planning grants to assist districts in developing a final plan. In February 2005, the program office received 22 final applications. Ray SWCD failed to meet the

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 16

February deadline. In March 2005, the technical review group met and ranked the 22 projects, and in April 2005 the SALT staff relayed the technical review group's concerns to the districts and offered the top 15 ranking districts an opportunity to address the concerns.

Mr. Struempf stated that the districts would be surveyed later in the year for their comments on the process and other aspects of the SALT Program.

The review committee is made up of several agencies and programs. The individuals selected for the review committee have a statewide perspective on the nonpoint pollution problems associated with production agriculture and have statewide responsibilities in their specialized areas. The individuals in the review group have expertise to analyze the problems in the watershed and, if the solutions are appropriate in solving the water quality concerns. The review committee looks at the project's goals and ranks them based on the expected accomplishments for each watershed. Once the projects are approved, the staff has the responsibility to review the progress every six months to make sure the district is on target to meet their goals for the watershed.

Mr. Struempf pointed out that in the past, the commission approved the review committee's highest-ranking proposals within budget limits.

There were 22 districts that submitted proposals. After the proposals were received in the office in early February, the review committee reviewed the proposals prior to interviewing the districts on March 23 and 24. The interview helps the reviewers get a better understanding of the proposal and clarify any discrepancies noted. After the interview, each reviewer was given seven high votes, seven medium votes, and eight low votes to cast. This process allowed the reviewers to put the proposals in three different groups of high, medium, and low.

The maximum budget established by the commission is \$750,000 per project. Grundy asked for \$299,500 and St. Francois asked for \$246,500. Both of these projects are utilizing 319 dollars to supplement their grants. The top 15 projects addressed agricultural

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 17

nonpoint source concerns, such as, erosion control, buffer establishment, grazing management, irrigation concerns, waste management, nutrient and pest management. The average annual personnel budget was roughly \$23,000 a year. Most of the projects presented had substantial partner commitment.

Mr. Struempf pointed out that ten of the districts with proposals that ranked in the top 15 had an ongoing project or had completed an AgNPS SALT grant. So far these ten districts with projects have achieved or are on target to achieve their goals. None of the top 15 districts are currently in management strategy with a current project.

The commission devoted a total of \$56,963,020 for AgNPS SALT projects with appropriations through 2008 in their long-range plan. Additional SALT funding is dependent upon the sales tax being renewed and receiving appropriations past 2008.

The commission has obligated \$51,168,067 in projects approved through the first six calls and has \$5,794,953 in unobligated dollars for approval of any new projects. Of the \$51,168,067 obligate to districts for SALT projects, \$2,349,598 is unobligated by the districts for SALT projects. When you add the unobligated amounts to the amount left to obligate to the districts, the amount totals \$8,144,541 that could possibly be used for approval of new projects.

The cumulative total for the 15 highest-ranking projects is \$9,639,563 and for the 13 projects the cumulative budget is \$8,306,144.

By looking at the current budget for all the SALT projects, one could assume the commission would need to over obligate their SALT budget if they hope to utilize the full \$56,963,020 budgeted for SALT projects. If the commission approved 15 projects, staff felt comfortable that enough funding would be returned to commission to fully fund these projects. Money is returned to the commission when the districts are not able to utilize all the money budgeted to them or projects are cancelled due to lack of progress in achieving their goals. If the sales tax is renewed, the over obligating of funds would not be a problem. If the sales tax is not

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 18

renewed, the commission could look at putting some stricter policies in place for unobligated dollars sent to the districts. Currently, the program allows the districts to carry over from year to year, unobligated cost-share and management funds for the life of the project.

If the 15 highest-ranking projects were approved there would still remain a fairly good representation from all seven-land resource areas in the state. Of the 53 active projects, only three are in management strategy.

Brad Powell from Bates County thanked the commission for the work that they do. He pointed out that they were number 13 and they take high priority in community involvement. They had some community meetings in an effort to put their proposal together. Beth Walter from Mercer County, who was ranked 14/15, stated they came into the technical review without many goals for streambank miles. They have since upped their goals in that area. They have had a lot of landowner interest since the review. When asked what the status of their current project, Ms. Walter answered they were ahead of schedule based on the charts used by SALT. Ken Westrich from Scott County stated he felt that they had a project that people were very interested in, they think they can do a lot of good work, and he encouraged the commission to try and fund all 15 projects. When asked if they had another SALT project, Mr. Westrich answered yes. When asked if they had any problems with spending \$1,500,000 more, Mr. Struempf answered some districts might ask for the full amount, but only use part of it. Also partner dollars can be used in place of SALT funds. Mr. Struempf stated that personally he thought that in the next seven years the money would be available to the districts.

John Aylward made a motion to approve the 15 highest-ranking projects. Kathryn Braden seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 19

H. NEW BUSINESS

1. Request for Funding to Develop Additional Solutions for Streambank Erosion

Bill Wilson introduced the next request, based on a request from Commissioner Kreisler and after conferring with Chair Brown. This was after a meeting on March 22 that was requested by Commissioner Kreisler with Mr. Ron Hardecke. Mr. Wilson introduced Mr. Hardecke to review a request for funding demonstration projects that would address a solution for streambank erosion.

Mr. Hardecke proceeded to give an overview of the proposal, background information on how they had reached this point, and then presented figures he had received from the Corp of Engineers (Corp).

Mr Hardecke said that landowners across the state have been very concerned about streambank erosion and their inability to do anything about it. There has been an increasing restrictive environment with the different regulations from different agencies, which restrict landowners from addressing the problem. Mr. Hardecke stated that practices that concern streambank erosion had been considered by the commission in the past mainly dealt with those approved by the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) such as cedar revetment and the rock rip rap, which are excellent practices according to Mr. Hardecke. He stated that the rip rap was very costly and there was not enough state, federal, or private money to fix all the streambank erosion in the state. Because of this, they began to look for alternatives and are trying to work with the different state and federal agencies on a pilot project that would show, under the state and federal agency supervision, that other practices were viable and good for the environment. Mr. Hardecke stated they were not looking for cost-share. They were looking to establish the fact that they could use the on site materials, such as vegetation and the gravel that was obstructing the streams to resolve streambank erosion. The landowners would use the gravel to repair the streambank and it would open the channel to the water during flood stage. Mr. Hardecke stated that he started on this back in 2001 and 2002. At that time, the Land Reclamation Commission was promulgating new regulations on gravel removal and as a result there were more restrictions on removing vegetation from the streams. At that point, they saw that if those regulations went into place, it would further restrict landowners from addressing the erosion problem.

Mr. Hardecke stated that Leslie Holloway from Missouri Farm Bureau and he met with John Hoskins, Director of the Department of Conservation and proposed a pilot project under their supervision to show that it would be an acceptable practice. The reason they chose MDC was because they knew that DNR and

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 20

other agencies go to MDC for their expertise on stream matters. In April of 2003 there was a tour for MDC, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and DNR staff to four sites in Gasconade and Maries Counties as proposed project sites.

During the summer of 2003, MDC worked up a proposal for two of the sites. In the fall of 2003, the landowners applied for 404 permits with the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers. In October 2003, a state legislator became interested in the project and the House Agriculture Committee was given a tour of some of the sites. At that time there was some legislation concerning gravel removal. Mr. Hardecke stated that the legislators were interested and were looking for some action to be taken to address the problem.

Mr. Hardecke stated that in February 2004, it was time in the Corp permit process for a site visit. Included in that meeting and tour were representatives from the Corp, NRCS, DNR, MDC, Congressman Kenny Hulshof, Fish and Wildlife, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). After that, the Corp presented another set of requirements for the landowners for more studies and proposals that landowners would have to complete with their own money. Because of this, the landowners withdrew their permit application. Mr. Hardecke said that Roger Hanson from NRCS has worked closely with him during that time and had set aside some funding through EQIP for cost-share on the pilot project program, had it gone forward.

Mr. Hardecke's said that the group had a meeting at the U.S. Capitol after the project fell apart. He stated that Senator Bond put them in contact with Colonel Michael Rossi from the executive branch of the U.S. Corp. of Engineers in Kansas City. In August 2004, information was provided to Colonel Rossi that they were interested in assisting the landowners with a more cost-effective solution to streambank erosion. In October 2004, Mr. Hardecke stated they met with Colonel Rossi and he indicated he wanted to go forward with the project. In March 2005, they met with staff from Senator Bond's office in Washington DC and they were setting up a proposal for some grant money or cost-share on a pilot project to be run by the Corp. In April 2005, Colonel Rossi sent a group of Corp personnel out to tour several locations in Gasconade and Warren Counties. Mr. Hardecke stated the reason for this tour was because the Corp kept saying that this practice had never worked. Mr. Hardecke indicated that it had worked, but not under the Corp supervision because they never would authorize this type of practice to be done. The Corp was shown what landowners had done on their own, that worked and worked for various periods of time. Mr. Hardecke stated the Corp was very impressed by what they saw and they indicated they did not

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 21

have any idea that this was what Mr. Hardecke was talking about or that things were that bad. The Corp informed Mr. Hardecke that the funds that Senator Bond was acquiring had to have a state match for the project to go forward and the Corp office in Kansas City, under their leadership and supervision, would run the project.

Mr. Hardecke reviewed some of the information, that he presented to the commission, which included Missouri Farm Bureau policy on this issue and cost projections that the Corp. had initially prepared. Mr. Hardecke stated the way he was approaching the issue was to focus on soil erosion, fish habitat, and water quality. Part of his solution was to repair existing bank erosion by removal and/or relocating gravel, vegetation, and debris from the existing channel. The most common criticism given when this is talked about is that he wants to channelize it. Mr. Hardecke stated this was not what they want to do. They want to return it to where the channel was before the bank eroded.

Mr. Hardecke reviewed the initial cost estimates that the Corp had prepared. He stated that he had requested additional detailed information from the Corp. but had not received that at this time. The initial estimates showed that the Corp projected it would cost \$477,000 over two years and they were looking for about 35 percent state match. Mr. Hardecke stated that they initially needed \$80,000 for two years, \$160,000 total from the commission to satisfy the state match requirement. At this time, Mr Hardecke stated that he was just making the commission aware of this proposal, but wanted to wait until they received the detailed information from the Corp before asking the commission to proceed with considering this request. These funds would be used to fund many projects around the state.

When asked if MDC had offered any funding, Mr. Hardecke answered no. When asked if they would, Mr. Hardecke answered that they never had in the last two years. Elizabeth Brown stated she appreciated his concern, but that the commission had been advised by the Attorney General's Office that the commission's responsibility ended at the edge of the stream with other conservation on the ground. The commission was also advised that they did not have any responsibility going down into the stream. Ms. Brown stated she wondered if the commission could even give money to a pilot project because of this. Mr. Hardecke asked what would prevent them from approving this request was it regulation that kept them from doing so? Ms. Brown answered that the constitution says they are required to protect the agriculture land. Mr. Hardecke stated this is agriculture land. Ms. Brown reiterated concerns with the legality of funding this type of proposal.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 22

Brad McCord from MDC indicated that there was a stream unit person present to answer questions. When asked where Mr. Hardecke saw his funds coming from, he answered that landowners were willing to do it on their own just so they would not have the regulatory hassle. Mr. McCord stated that the department had taken note of some of the activities and were trying to move forward a few ideas and try new approaches on MDC land. Mr. McCord introduced Paul Calvert to answer questions for the commission. Paul Calvert from MDC stated they are the technical lead for both the Soil and Water Commission and NRCS on streambank erosion issues. Mr. Calvert informed the commission that they study the streams because they are dynamic and not very predictable. Because of this, Mr. Calvert stated they are satisfied with an 80 percent success rate on the streambank practices that are done with their technical assistance. He informed the commission that MDC worked with Mr. Hardecke on his projects up until the time the landowner backed out or other things fell through. He also stated that MDC has in place a streambank stabilization committee that was getting information from landowners, field staff, and other states on different types of techniques that might be more economically feasible for a landowner. Mr. Calvert also stated that on this issue, the Corp and DNR 401 section are the regulatory agencies and this is a regulatory issue that should be addressed by those agencies. When asked if there were funds available from MDC, Mr. Calvert answered there was none within his current budget. Mr. Calvert stated that a request would need to be submitted to the Conservation Commission for their consideration.

Dwaine Gelnar from NRCS stated they had tried to do some work with streambank stabilization in the past through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). He also stated that they had some problems with meeting NRCS standards. He stated that NRCS would be supportive of any kind of pilot that looked into these kinds of situations, but they do not have it built into their program. Mr. McCord stated that MDC provides about \$1,000,000 a year in landowner cost-share and conservation practices, about \$75,000 to \$100,000 annually goes to streambank stabilization projects that have been confirmed to work. Leon Kreisler stated he felt that program staff should pursue this so that at the next meeting the commission would know more about the actual funding needed.

Mr. McCord stated that MDC would be happy to work with Mr. Hardecke and program staff to come up with a recommendation. When asked if there was any research funding left in the budget, Sarah Fast answered that the commission had closed off their research projects, because the commission was going to end them

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 23

in 2006 due to the end of the current tax. Ms. Fast stated that if the commission wanted to reopen them, it was a commission decision. Dan Engemann from the Missouri Department of Agriculture (MDA) stated they were supportive of the project. He felt that the interested parties were at the table. When asked if MDA had any funding available, Mr. Engemann answered they did not. When asked if the University of Missouri had funding, David Baker answered no, but he had expertise that could possibly assist in addressing this issue. David Baker said that Dr. Gardner was reviewing this issue with others at the University of Missouri. When asked, Scott Totten stated that the department's role is regulatory due to the department reviewing requests and issuing 401 water quality certification for projects, such as this. Mr. Totten also stated that in the past when a pilot project was proposed, the department was considering approving a 401 certification for the pilot project. In regard to funding, most of the other funds that the department administers are from federal sources and would not be useable as matching funds.

Bill Wilson stated that state and federal regulations would have to be met before any funding could be considered. He also stated that program staff had looked at the possibility of utilizing research funds. Due to the appropriation language, that these funds must be dispersed to colleges and universities, staff had met with David Baker and Dr. John Gardner regarding this request. Mr. Wilson also stated that program staff had attended a meeting with Representative Tom Loehner regarding streambank erosion in the Maries River Watershed. After this meeting, additional meetings are being planned to review the issue in that watershed. When asked about the legality of the issue, Zora Mulligan from the Attorney General's Office answered she would like to speak to her management regarding this issue.

It was the consensus of the commission to direct staff to work with Mr. Hardecke and various partners to gather more information and to bring this request back to the commission for future consideration.

2. State Government Review Committee –Department of Natural Resources Director Doyle Childers Invited

Director Doyle Childers presented a report on the government review committee, which is looking at how state government should be organized.

Mr. Childers stated that in conversations that have occurred he heard different comments about what should happen to Parks and Soil and Water. One group thought that Soil and Water should be in MDC and others thought it should be in MDA and a few people even mentioned it should be put into a special area. He

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 24

had also observed some people did not even know where the program was. Some thought it was part of MDC or MDA. Mr. Childers pointed out that there was a considerable amount of confusion as to where the general public thought it should be. He stated because of this there are advantages and disadvantages. The advantage is trying to appeal to all the positive attributes.

Mr. Childers stated that looking at the issue from the department's standpoint, getting the joint resolution renewing the Parks and Soil Sales Tax out to the vote of the people was their number one legislative priority. This served a very useful purpose in not having to put resources into getting it on the ballot by the petition system that had been used before. The disadvantage of this was that by getting out and getting signatures was a way to educate people to the importance of what is done through the organization. Since this would not be done, the effort would have to focus on how you communicate with a large number of people in a manner they remember. Mr. Childers urged the commission to look at all the opportunities they have in the future to get the word out about what the renewal of the tax would do.

Mr. Childers proceeded to review how the committee was set up and some questions the department was asked. During discussion it was brought up should Soil and Water go to another department, because that was one of the questions that was asked. After analyzing this, the results indicated that it could be hard to get the tax passed if the program was moved to another department. Mr. Childers stated that Parks and Soil and Water Conservation were the two programs he thought would be most likely to gain attention at being moved into another department. Mr. Childers stated it is important that when the tax comes up for renewal, it would be very important to analyze what a change would do, as far as the support that would be available. He reiterated how important it was to get the information out about what the program does.

When asked if he thought they were going to move the program to another department, Mr. Childers answered that the review committee could very well recommend that. When asked who thought it could be better handled somewhere besides DNR, Mr. Childers answered that it had come from several different entities, but he did not know how many of them had testified regarding that. He pointed out that the commission could still give testimony at the upcoming meetings. When asked if there had been any talk about putting Parks and Soil and Water together in its own department, Mr. Childers answered that DNR is perceived as being that, that was the idea originally. DNR having an interest in water and soil that was why it was put here. When asked who was on the review committee, Mr. Childers answered there are 20 members selected from broad

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 25

spectrum of people. The two chairs are Warren Erdman and Steve Bradford and they both have extensive backgrounds in reorganization. The subcommittee members are Charles Kruse, Paul Steele, and Joyce Wood. When asked if they wanted to put Soil and Water somewhere else because of the tax, Mr. Childers answered he suspected that some entities would like to have the tax money, that's a natural affinity of governmental groups. But he thought that some people think of it as what is the best function, how can a certain function be carried out, what's the best way. He also stated he took that at face value that it is a sincere, legitimate thought about what's the best way government can function. Mr. Childers stated that someone put a lot of thought into it when it was set up originally. He reiterated the need to remind the public of the contributions that have been made and what the future plans are. Sarah Fast pointed out that the commissioners had a copy of the letter with the dates of up coming meetings of the review committee.

Elizabeth Brown indicated she planned to attend one of the review committee meetings to testify. Kathryn Braden indicated she would attend the meeting in Springfield.

I. REVIEW/EVALUATION - Continued

a. Special Area Land Treatment

1. Wright SWCD – Request to Pilot Cost-Share on Feed and Waste Storage Structure for Beef Cows in Woods Fork Project (if approved in the 7th call)

April Brandt presented a request from Wright SWCD for cost-share on feed and waste management structures as a pilot practice in the Woods Fork Agricultural Nonpoint Source (AgNPS) Special Area Land Treatment (SALT) Project.

In August 2004, program staff was informed of some innovative feed and waste management structures that had been completed as N312 practices using SALT cost-share funds. The district felt that since the structure met NRCS standards and specifications for the N312 practice, they were eligible for cost-share.

In a letter dated October 20, 2004, the Wright County board requested the commission to allow them to cost-share on feed and waste management structures. In November 2004, the issue was taken to the commission.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 26

According to the district, many beef producers feed hay and supplement to cattle in areas near creeks and streams where they are protected from wind and they have access to water. Because of this, manure is concentrated near a water source and not spread out evenly over fields. This also results in damage to forage quality and sedimentation in the stream. The district believes this type of structure would provide water quality protection and could complement a planned grazing system. The letter also stated these structures are designed to protect water quality by storing waste for 90-120 days, and have been funded through Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) at 50 percent cost-share. The structures are designed and sized, based on the number of livestock fed.

Wright County has completed three feed and waste management structures with SALT funds to date; one for a dairy operation, and two for beef operations. The average actual cost for the three structures was \$30,822.93, and the average SALT cost-share was \$22,058.39.

At the November 2004 commission meeting some of the comments and concerns were if there would be enough funding available to do this type of structure, how would the district handle the demand, if funding was limited how would the landowners be chosen, there would need to be policy stating exactly what would or would not be paid on, and consider doing 50 percent cost-share to spread the money further. The commission passed the motion that directed staff to develop policies for the practice using EQIP as a model.

In December 2004, a meeting with NRCS was held to discuss the practice and EQIP policy regarding the practice. NRCS staff indicated that districts were doing these structures as adaptations of current EQIP practices such as Waste Storage Facility, Manure Transfer, and Heavy Use Area Protection. Ms. Brandt pointed out that NRCS was in the process of developing guidelines specifically for this practice.

In February 2005, staff and Commissioner Kreisler toured two structures that had been built for beef operations. After discussion and research, a draft policy was developed. In May, staff and Commissioner Kreisler met and reviewed the draft policy. Also in May, staff met with NRCS to review the policy.

Ms. Brandt proceeded to cover the draft policy. The purpose of the structure is to collect and store animal waste to reduce runoff of nutrient,

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 27

sediment, and fecal coliform to adjacent waterbodies. The practice applies when the following conditions are met: cattle feeding areas are close to streams, pasture based operations meet NRCS 528A Prescribed Grazing specifications, and a waste management plan has been developed for the cattle operation situated in the Woods Fork AgNPS SALT Project. The completed practice would have to meet NRCS standards and specifications for applicable practices.

When asked if the district had any idea of how many structures would be requested, Missy Wollard from Wright County answered they had budgeted for five and set aside \$127, 000 for the five. She informed the commission that they might not build all five. When asked how many Planned Grazing Systems (DSP-3s), Ms. Wollard answered they had quite a few. When asked if they had any dairies with the waste system, Ms. Wollard answered they have one in the county with this type of waste system. Ms. Wollard followed up that it had been cost-shared through their Whetstone SALT Project. When asked if it was at 50 percent, Ms. Wollard answered it was at 75 percent. Ms. Wollard informed the commission that her concern was that for consistency she would like for it to be kept at 75 percent cost-share. She also thought the cap was a good thing, but would like for it to be \$20,000 and put an animal unit price on it. Leon Kreisler stated he saw this practice as something that would help water quality but very little on the reduction of soil erosion, therefore he did not see this as a high priority as far as them spending their money on it. He stated he thought they should go ahead with it, but he was not sure about the 75 percent. He also stated if the building was used for something else, the funds should be repaid.

Kathryn Braden made a motion to approve the request to do feed and waste management structures as a pilot practice with the policies developed, in the Woods Fork AgNPS Salt Project with the amendment of 75 percent cost-share. Richard Fordyce seconded the motion.

Mr. Fordyce asked if the cap would be \$15,000. Ms. Braden answered yes. Mr. Fordyce asked Ms. Wollard if she had any idea of how many people already qualify that might be interested. Ms. Wollard answered that when they wrote the application they had in mind five, but they had not spoken to them.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 28

When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Management Strategy for SALT Projects

a. Informational Report on Cape Girardeau's Hubble Creek Project

Kevin Scherr presented a report regarding Cape Girardeau's Hubble Creek AgNPS SALT Project that is in management strategy. A project is placed into management strategy when progress falls below the minimum rate of progress, which the commission set at 80 percent complete, by the end of the project life. Management strategy is intended to help districts get back on track in order for their project to be successful.

A project will stay in management strategy until progress is equal to or exceeds the minimum progress on the progress schedule. If a project is behind for three report periods, a project will be terminated.

On April 21, 2004, a Semi-Annual Progress Report for the Hubble Creek AgNPS SALT Project was received. This report covered July through December of the third year. It showed progress was at 11.44 percent while the minimum was 15 percent, which is a difference of 3.5 percent. The district submitted a revised plan with changes reducing or eliminating acres of Cropland Protection and Sod Waterways. Since the district reduced or eliminated some of their goals, they agreed to reduce their personnel grant funds in an equivalent proportion to their overall goals. This is a reduction of \$6,474 from their \$84,300 personnel grant funds that were budgeted over the six years of the project's life.

The sixth Semi-Annual Progress Report, which includes January through June of last year, indicated the project was at 21.9 percent while the minimum was 23 percent, which is a difference of 1.1 percent.

The seventh Semi-Annual Progress Report, which includes July through December 2004, indicated the project was at 26.09

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 29

percent, while the minimum was 32 percent, which is a difference of 5.91 percent.

If progress continues to fall further behind for a third time, it is commission policy that the project be terminated. At that time, the district will be given the opportunity to approve any pending cost-share applications. The cost-share applications that are approved would be funded with SALT funds. If the project gets terminated according to commission policy, the district may present an appeal to the commission.

b. Informational Report on Knox's North Fork of Salt River

Davin Althoff presented an update on Knox SWCD's North Fork of the Salt River AgNPS SALT project which was placed in management strategy following the fall FY05 reporting period.

On May 21, 2003, Knox County SWCD was awarded approval for the North Fork of the Salt River AgNPS SALT Project for implementation to begin on July 1, 2003.

Commission policy states that "if a project's percentage of progress falls below the minimum percentage established by the commission after the first three reporting periods, the project will be placed in management strategy."

Following their third Semi Annual Progress Report, period of July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004, the North Fork of the Salt River progress level was 4.68 percent, which was below the minimum of 5 percent for that period. A letter was sent to Knox SWCD's Board of Supervisors explaining the situation and requested time at their next board meeting. At the meeting, staff reviewed the letter and explained alternatives. The two alternatives were termination of the project by the board or to devise approaches to remove the project from management strategy. Staff provided guidance and possible suggestions to the board if they elected to devise an approach to revitalize the SALT project.

After the board meeting, Knox SWCD Board of Supervisor chose to submit a revised plan to raise the North Fork of the Salt River AgNPS SALT project out of management strategy. After

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 30

reviewing the revised plan, staff approved the approach that the district developed. The district addressed the concerns, re-evaluated, and reduced various goals. The goals reduced were Pasture Management from 7,000 to 5,250 acres; Crop Management from 8,200 to 4,100 acres; Buffers from 310 to 210 acres; Gully Erosion practices from 102 to 92 each; and Sheet and Rill Erosion practices from 1,600 to 1,440 acres. The district also reduced personnel funds for the last five years of the project by \$22,674 equaling a 23.5 percent reduction proportionate to the decrease in the importance of the goals that were reduced. The district chose to remove \$14,000 from management funds earmarked for field equipment. The reductions in management will be transferred to SALT Cost-Share to increase funding for various practices.

Due to the reductions, the district's new percent complete is at 5.34 percent and is above the minimum percent established by the commission. The revisions will move the North Fork of the Salt River AgNPS SALT Project out of management strategy for the current reporting period.

Leon Kreisler asked if staff was satisfied with the reductions to salary, Mr. Althoff answered yes.

c. Request From Benton's Deer Creek Project to Change Project Goals

Gina Luebbering presented a request from Benton SWCD to change the goals for the Deer Creek Project. This project was implemented on July 1, 2001.

Following their seventh reporting period or fourth year of the seven year project, which covered July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004, the progress level was 18.73 percent, which is lower than the commission minimum of 23 percent. At that time the project was placed on management strategy.

According to the AgNPS Handbook, when a project is not meeting progress according to the progress schedule it will then be placed in management strategy. Staff will send a letter to the district board indicating their status and will request time at the next district board meeting. At that meeting the SALT Coordinator will

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 31

explain the letter concerning the issue and present the board with two alternatives. These alternatives are to terminate the project or the board is to devise approaches to remove the project from management strategy. If the board decides to revitalize the project and writes a letter to the commission, staff will review the letter and decide to accept or deny. Ms. Luebbering stated this is where the project is at currently.

Upon meeting with the board, the board stated the watershed plan was not put together very well and that landowner cooperation was not what they expected.

Ms. Luebbering reminded the commission that at the May 19, 2004 commission meeting, Benton SWCD presented a request to increase personnel by \$13,500. At that time, the commission was also informed that there were some concerns in regard to the goals and if they could be met. The commission was also informed that program staff had discussed the possibility of revising the districts goals, but the district did not feel that it was an issue.

The commission was informed that they had a copy of the Action Plan submitted by Benton SWCD on April 22, 2005, goal revisions, explanations, and watershed land use maps. Benton SWCD also provided information regarding changes in land use. Ms. Luebbering proceeded to cover the Semi-Annual Progress Report.

Some of the goals that were reduced were: grazing from 22,000 acres to 2,650 acres, erosion from 3,535 acres to 110 acres, streambank stabilization from 10,000 feet 1,000 feet, riparian protection from 155 acres to 30 acres, and gully erosion from 5,000 feet to 0 feet. Based upon the change of goals in contrast with the percent importance there is a 31.6 percent decrease in the project scope. If there were a decrease in personnel in proportion to the decrease in goals, the district's personnel budget would be an average of \$23,826.22 for the remaining three year of the project. Benton SWCD's current average is \$34,833 for the remaining three years.

Tina Hovendick, District Manager of Benton County, informed the commission that they had a copy of the letter from the district

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 32

explaining the reason for the large reduction and the need to keep their personnel as it was listed. When asked why they were so far behind on the goals, Ms. Hovendick answered the main reason was because their original goals were set too high and the reduced goals were at the stage that the original goals should have been. When asked if they had had a SALT before, Ms. Hovendick answered this was their first, but they did have plans to apply for one in another area of the county. Gene Schmitz, the Board Secretary for Benton and Pettis Counties, stated they knew it was normal to reduce personnel budget when goals are reduced. He asked that the commission take into consideration that they have two and half years left in the project and there was still work that needed to be done, which means they still need a project manager. He also stated they felt that if there were a significant reduction in the personnel budget would put them at risk of losing their current project manager. Mr. Schmitz then pointed out that they had been operating below the amount budgeted for personnel for three of the four years of the project, which was a saving of approximately \$9,000. He pointed out that their total personnel expenses for the entire seven-year project was approximately 10 percent below the maximum that is allowed by DNR for SALT Projects for personnel. Jamie Henderson, SALT Project Manager, stated that in May of 2004 the commission received a request from them to increase their personnel budget by \$13,500. That was for their District Clerk and the District Manager because they were assisting with the SALT project. He reminded the commission that the county commission cut funds by a significant amount and that was why they had requested the additional funds. When asked how their personnel budget was divided, Ms. Hovendick answered that \$5,080 per year goes to her salary as the District Manager for cost-share, \$4,000 goes to the District Clerk for Information/Education, and the remaining goes to the SALT Project Manager. John Alyward stated that if the original goals had been realistic they probably would not have been approved. Merdith Palmer, the Vice-Chairman, stated that when they started the project they got a group of farmers together and they started a steering committee and they came up with different ideas. He stated that the steering committee that was made up of farmers gave the district amounts of acreage.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 33

John Aylward made a motion to approve the project goal revision and require that the district proportionately decrease personnel by 25 percent. Richard Fordyce seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

J. REQUESTS

1. Land Assistance Section

a. Cost-Share

1. Buchanan SWCD – Additional Tile on an Existing Terrace System

Joyce Luebbering presented a request from the Buchanan County SWCD requesting the commission authorize cost-share on an existing terrace system.

Cost-share policy states, “if the board of supervisors desires to approve cost-share assistance for installation of tile in an existing waterway or terrace, they must obtain approval from the commission.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) must certify that the existing waterway or terrace requires the addition of tile to preserve the life span of the practice, or that the tile is necessary to control erosion.

The maintenance life span of the practice starts when the board approves the claim for the tile installation.”

According to a letter from Buchanan Board of Supervisors, terrace outlet systems were installed on Mr. William Frakes’ property in 1996 and 2003. Mr. Frakes’s property is adjacent to Mark Pierce. Mr. Frakes’ terrace system outlets at the property line and is emptying directly onto Mr. Pierce’s property.

According to the Soil Conservation Technician report, both tile systems outlet into ditch bottoms in a woody fence row above the property line of Mr. Pierce’s farm. The report stated that when the terraces were constructed for Mr. Frakes, one option would have been to declare there was not suitable outlet and not build any

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 34

terraces. But rather than not build them, it was opted to outlet the systems in the fence row. The second option would have been to have the former owner of the Pierce farm install pipe across their farm. Because the former owner had never installed conservation practices, the field office did not pursue this alternative. The technician's report stated the soil and water cost-share program requires that the landowner that is building the terrace system bear the cost, with cost-share money, of installing any tile across neighboring lands to an outlet. The program does not require a landowner to install tile across a neighboring land to an outlet. The program promotes the landowners to work together to install a practice that is suitable for the erosion problem. The technician report also stated that while some of the erosion on Mr. Pierce's farm is due to the land being farmed annually and erosion being present before the Frakes' terrace system, water from the terraces constructed on Mr. Frakes's farm adds to Mr. Pierce's erosion problem.

In the letter from the board, the board states that Mr. Pierce's requested cost-share for a tile extension on the two existing terrace systems to correct the erosion problem on his property. The cost for the system would not exceed \$875.48.

When asked if they had approved similar request, Ms. Luebbering answered yes. When asked if the previous landowner was opposed to putting the tile in, Ms. Luebbering answered that they did not even pursue that alternative.

Richard Fordyce made a motion to approve the board's request. John Aylward seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Jackson SWCD – Landowner Concerns Regarding the Commission's Cancelled Check Policy

Ron Redden presented a request from a Jackson County landowner that asked to address the commission in regard to their cancelled check policy.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 35

Mr. Redden proceeded to give a background as to why the commission felt it was necessary to implement this policy. In the June 2003 audit that was prepared by the State Auditor, it was recommended that the commission require landowners to provide copies of cancelled checks to support their invoices that they were submitting for reimbursement. Mr. Redden pointed out that this was the third time the Auditor had made this recommendation. At that time the auditor requested 24 landowners to provide a copy of their cancelled checks. This recommendation was made due to the fact that when the auditor requested 24 landowners to submit copies of cancelled checks, only 15 landowners responded. One of the 15 that responded indicated they could not provide a cancelled check because they had bartered for the services even though the invoice was for \$11,498. A second landowner provided a cancelled check that was less than the amount indicated on the invoice. The Auditor stated that without a cancelled check there was little assurance as to what the landowner actually paid.

In July of 2004, the commission implemented a policy that any paid invoice for more than \$500 had to have a cancelled check. This policy was effective for all applications approved after January 1, 2005.

Some examples of documents that can be used in lieu of cancelled checks are, cashiers checks, money orders, credit card receipts, and picture copies of the cashed check from the bank.

Mr. Redden stated that when Geral Rinacke was asked to provide a cancelled check to support his invoice, he indicated that there was a problem because the check was for less than the total indicated on the bill. It was pointed out to the commission that Mr. Rinacke has provided the district with a copy of a cashiers check in the amount of \$8,367 for the total of the bill. Mr. Redden informed the commission that a check had been sent to Mr. Rinacke on April 14, 2005.

Mr. Rinacke stated that he had not had a structure done for quite sometime with government assistance. He indicated he had voted in favor of the tax to help get the system going, but he would not vote for it again because of what the bureaucracy had done as far as getting the structure in. He stated that the terraces were deeper

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 36

than what he wanted. Mr. Rinacke stated he had a paid receipt from his contractor. He was approved for \$5,400 of the estimated \$6,300 that was indicated it would cost to put the structure in, but the actual cost was \$8,300. He indicated the structure was not correct and he was going to have to go back and correct the drain tile outlet. He felt that the policy on getting assistance from the tax was too complicated. He stated that there needed to be an easier way to get funding out to the landowner.

3. Dallas SWCD - Exceed the \$60 Per Acre Limit and the Four Year Participation Limitation on a DSP-3 Practice

Marcy Oerly presented a request from Dallas SWCD asking the commission to allow a variance to policy and allow a landowner to exceed the \$60 per acre limit on the planned grazing system (DSP-3) and a variance to the four-year practice participation policy.

Commission policy states, "Each application is not to exceed 75 percent of the actual county average costs up to \$60 per acre for all component and for the total number of acres in the entire system. A maximum of \$9,000 in cost-share is allowed per landowner for all farms owned by that landowner through this practice."

Commission policy also states, "The \$9,000 maximum can be obtained through multiple applications over a four-year consecutive year period. Multiple applications can be for the same farms and fields or for different farms and fields. The four-consecutive year period begins from the day the board approves the initial claim, meaning that the last application must be approved within that four-year period."

Ms. Oerly proceeded to review the reasoning behind the commission's four-consecutive year policy concerning the DSP-3. Before 1996, the DSP-3 was a pilot practice in a limited number of districts. This was done to help develop practice policies and allow cost-share on land that was not eroding at rates greater than tolerable limits. In 1996, the commission promulgated a rule change to exempt planned grazing systems from the excessive erosion requirement. Because of this exemption, it was developed as a demonstration practice and limitations were applied to the practice so that it met demonstration criteria. At the present time

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 37

there are money and time restrictions as well as grazing school and soil fertility requirements applied to the practice so that it complies with the demonstration concept. The commission felt the four-year limitation was necessary in order to qualify the DSP-3 as a demonstration practice and that after a four-year period the landowner or system manager should be able to realize both the economical as well as the environmental benefits.

Commission policy states, "The landowner is responsible for the maintenance of the cost-shared practice. Practices installed with state cost-share assistance must be maintained in good operating condition. The maintenance life of the practice is stated on the cost-share application. The landowner will be required to repay the cost-share if the practice is not maintained for the life of the practice."

Commission policy also allows one reseeding per field per original application. For warm season grass plantings, landowners must apply for reseeding within two years of the original practice completion date.

In a letter dated February 23, 2005, the Dallas Board of Supervisors explained that in June 2000, Mike Cheek completed a DSP-3 practice. A 16-acre field of warm season grass, cost-shared through the practice, failed through no fault of the landowner. In April 2001 the commission approved the board's request to exceed the \$60 per acre DSP-3 limit and allowed reseeding of the field. Due to various reasons, Mr. Cheek did not complete the reseeding and the board approved no cost-share. The letter also stated that Mr. Cheek now wants to reseed and requests cost-share assistance. June 15, 2000 was the original date of Mr. Cheek's claim, which is past the four-year limit of the DSP-3 practice and will be out of the five-year maintenance agreement in less than one month. It will cost \$1,488 in cost-share assistance to reseed the field now, compared to \$1,360 in 2001.

Mr. Oerly stated that program staff visited the field in April and spoke with both the district and NRCS staff. She also stated that staff did not have a good idea as to why the landowner did not reseed the field in 2001. Ms. Oerly proceeded to show the commission photographs of a stand of fescue interspersed with

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 38

various other vegetation. The grass stand was spotty, but Mr. Cheek does use it in his cattle rotation of the grazing system. Since 2001, the field had not been maintained. Because of the maintenance agreement violation, Ms. Oerly explained that it might be appropriate for the commission to consider requesting the landowner repay cost-share in the amount of \$800.

Tony Rosen, Dallas County Technician, stated the seeding failed and the landowner applied for new seeding, but by the time he was approved he did not have enough time to get it done by the NRCS deadline. Mr. Rosen informed the commission that he felt the landowner did not get the help he needed from the office. He also stated that the stand was very poor but that the landowner does manage his grazing system very well.

Elizabeth Brown stated that the commission had been pretty firm in the four-year policy because four years is a long time to complete a practice. Leon Kreisler stated the commission did not have any assurance that the landowner would complete the practice if an exception was granted. Richard Fordyce asked if there was anything keeping him from reseeding on his own, Ms. Brown answered no. John Aylward stated he thought they should let the landowner go ahead and reseed the field at his own cost but do not require him to repay cost-share.

It was the consensus of the commission to maintain current policy. The landowner would not be eligible to receive additional cost-share funds for the reseeding. However, he would not be required to repay cost-share.

b. Special Area Land Treatment (SALT)

1. Osage SWCD – Request to Allow Operator to Participate in Manure Transfer Practice

Davin Althoff presented a request from the Osage SWCD to allow a poultry producer within the Lower Maries River AgNPS SALT watershed to participate in the N634 Manure Transfer practice. The N634 Manure Transfer practice is designed to encourage landowners who produce animal waste on the farm and continually apply the animal waste on the same farm or field(s) to transfer the waste off of the farm or to other field(s) that can utilize the waste

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 39

based on a nutrient management plan. The poultry producer's unique situation is that the individual leases the buildings and farm but owns the birds. The producer requesting to participate in the practice has previously participated as a landowner for two years in the N634 Manure Transfer practice in the other AgNPS SALT project in Osage County, in the Loose Creek watershed. The individual was one of the producers recently granted a variance by the commission to be paid for the N634 Manure Transfer practice as a result of the NRCS removing their technical certification because of the lack of technical documentation to support payment of the claim. The variance was granted to 51 claims in the Loose Creek SALT. The district was asked to develop a nutrient management plan and to encourage the landowners to implement the third year at no costs to the state, which overrides the policy in the handbook stating they are eligible for three years.

In a letter from Osage SWCD, they are requesting permission to allow the producer to participate in the N634 Manure Transfer practice. The letter states that the producer is currently spreading the waste on the pastureland surrounding the poultry barns as well as moving the waste off-site to other landowners. In conversation with the district, the individual produces approximately 48,000 birds per year and has approximately 60 spreadable acres on the leased farm. The district projects the producer will request to transfer approximately 269 cubic yards of waste through the N634 Manure Transfer practice. The limited spreadable acres are a factor that compels the producer to move waste off site as mentioned in the letter. Since the producer is already moving the waste off of the farm, questions arise to whether an incentive is needed for the producer to continue to transfer the waste. In addition, current policy for the Manure Transfer practice is only applicable to landowners, because operators who lease these sites typically have to transfer the litter.

The producer has already received \$8,495 over two of the last three years by participating in the practice in the Loose Creek SALT project as a landowner. Policy states that a landowner is eligible for 3 years of payment. The most recent payment was granted a variance because documentation could not support the practice meeting NRCS guidelines. Should the producer have learned an economical benefit from previous participation in the practice, the

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 40

individual would not need more financial incentives to transfer more waste. The commission may wish to place a cap on this practice in the future.

When asked about the exceptions to the N634, Mr. Althoff answered there were two or three landowners that had applied and had claims submitted for N634 Manure Transfer and they could not provide documentation that the recipients of the manure followed the nutrient management plan and according to policy they are required to follow a nutrient management plan.

John Aylward made a motion to maintain commission policy by only allowing landowners to participate in this practice. Kathryn Braden seconded the motion.

When asked what the issue was, Sarah Fast answered that there was a producer who as a landowner-received payment in one watershed for two years. The landowner would be eligible for a third year in this watershed, except that was where a variance was granted because of problems, so the landowner was told that as part of the variance, he would not get the third year of payments in that watershed. Now as an operator in a second watershed in the county, he would like to receive payments as an operator. When asked what the difference was between an operator and an owner, Ms. Fast answered that in this case the operator owned the birds, but not the land he was spreading the waste on.

When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

2. District Assistance Section

a. Texas SWCD – Second Budget Revision

Jim Boschert presented a request for a budget revision from Texas SWCD to revise their budget for a second time.

In a letter from the district, the district states the request is due to turnover and the recent hiring of a full time district clerk. The district would like to transfer \$800 from their technical fund to the management fund and

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 41

\$3,000 from their technical grant to the administrative expenses grant. This would allow the district to utilize their district assistance allocation.

Mr. Boschert pointed out that districts are allowed to revise their budget once before the end of January. He also reminded the commission that previously the commission gave staff authority to approve first time requests that were received after the deadline. He also pointed out that in the past the commission had approved second budget revisions that were submitted by districts.

Leon Kreisler asked if the program had a problem with the request, Sarah Fast answered no.

Kathryn Braden made a motion to approve the request. Leon Kreisler seconded the motion. When asked by the chair, John Aylward, Kathryn Braden, Richard Fordyce, Leon Kreisler, and Elizabeth Brown voted in favor of the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

K. REPORTS

1. NRCS

Dwayne Gelnar reported they were in the middle of their Conservation Security Program (CSP) sign up that ended on May 27, 2005. This is a new program for NRCS and it has taken a lot of their time. He stated the watersheds selected were throughout the country. It was decided to run the program through on watershed basis because of limited funding. The program was set up so that everybody who was eligible for the program should be able to participate, but the funding was not there so it was decided to take 1/8 of the farming operations each year. Mr. Gelnar reported that in Missouri there were only seven watersheds. The funding decisions are made nationally. Then Mr. Gelnar stated there were 220 watersheds that were approved this year and the funding comes from approximately \$202,000,000 national that goes to funding the contracts in the watersheds.

Mr. Gelnar proceeded to cover stewardship and existing practice payments in CSP. The land is divided into cropland, grazing, and then by tiers.

Next Mr. Gelnar stated that they would limit the activities of NRCS employees to assist with burns. He stated they were in the process of revising their prescribed burn policy, such that it will eliminate the assistance of NRCS employees on site for prescribed burns, but NRCS will continue to develop prescribed burn plans.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 42

2. MASWCD

Peggy Lemons reported that NACD North Central Regional Meeting is scheduled for July 10-13 in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Ms. Lemons proceeded to update the commission on the upcoming 2005 Canon Envirothon that will be held in Springfield, Missouri. She reported that they have 215 volunteers for the event.

3. Legislative

Bill Wilson reported that the Senate Joint Resolution 1 was passed on April 27, 2005.

Mr. Wilson reported that House Bill 455 was passed by the Legislature on May 13. The bill removes the requirement that watershed district trustees must live in the watershed district.

Mr. Wilson proceeded to cover the upcoming Area Meetings that will be held from August 15 – 25 throughout the state.

4. Staff

Milt Barr presented an update on the Soil and Water Information System. In FY03 the department set standards for the information systems for future development and replacement of outdated applications that had problems in the current development tools formats and compatibility with new operating systems. The program data system had the above problems and needed to be converted to the department standards and internet based to solve the operating system compatibility with districts and USDA networks.

In FY04 a contractor did an analysis and the cost for the development recommendation and cost estimate using the department websphere standards provided an estimate of \$970,000. The final estimate was much higher than what the contractor had discussed. Due to concerns it was decided to ask for quotations for the project from at least two other vendors. The vendors were asked to quote the cost using two other development tools beside websphere, and they were .net and Allfusion.

In January 2005, quotes were received and reviewed by a program and department technical evaluation team including the Department of Purchasing and

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 43

Contracting Officer and IT for review of overall point evaluation including cost. Rose International was selected as the vendor with a final cost estimate of \$1,040,000. The development tool selected was websphere. One of Rose's technicians is currently working on consolidating the old Payment, Evaluation, and Tracking application and maintaining the old DCS system and the program is very satisfied with the work and believes Rose will have a good understanding of the business processes for the overall project.

From the initial estimates in FY04 approximately \$1,000,000 was budgeted for the project with about \$400,000 expected to be used FY05 and the balance in FY06. Because of all of the delays and the time that has past, the majority of the funds have now been budgeted for FY06 with any carry over will be to FY07.

Mr. Barr reminded the commission that starting July 1, 2005 the Office of Administration will be consolidating and directly controlling all Department Information Technology Personnel. He indicated that we were fortunate that one of the technologists will continue to work with the program as the project manager for the new system.

Scott Totten, Division Director, presented Judy Stinson with letter from Director Doyle Childers recognizing her work on the State Fair Committee.

Next Mr. Totten presented Bill Wilson with a letter from Director Doyle Childers recognizing his work with FFA.

Sarah Fast informed the commission of a thank you letter from Osage SWCD for the work the commission did with their issue. She also pointed out that there was announcement that the Missouri Land Improvement Contractors Association (LICA) received a national award. Next she informed the commission that Commissioner Brown had received an Agriculture Alumni Association Award from the University of Missouri College of Agriculture.

Bill Wilson introduced Adam McGee who was a new staff member in district assistance.

Gary Baclesse introduced Allen Clarke who was a new staff member in cost-share.

MINUTES--MISSOURI SOIL & WATER DISTRICTS COMMISSION

May 24, 2005

Page 44

L. SUGGESTED DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Sarah Fast informed the commission that the next meeting was scheduled for June 23, 2005. August 4, 2005, commission would be before the Area Meetings.

Elizabeth Brown stated she would not be available on June 23. Ms. Fast asked if that date needed to be changed. Ms. Fast asked if the commission would want to schedule a meeting the week before the 23rd or after. The commission provided Ms. Fast with the dates of the 29th or 30th. It was decided that next commission meeting would be Thursday, June 30, 2005, beginning at 8:30 at DNR Conference Center in the Bennett Springs/Roaring River room in Jefferson City, Missouri. The August meeting was tentatively scheduled for Thursday, August 4, 2005, in Jefferson City, Missouri.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Leon Kreisler moved the meeting be adjourned. Richard Fordyce seconded the motion. Motion was approved by consensus at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Fast, Director
Soil and Water Conservation Program

Approved by:

Elizabeth Brown, Chairman
Missouri Soil & Water Districts Commission

/tm